FRADEN

BERESKIN & PARR

\$ 003/006 Grw

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Petert and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

10/040,438

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM		Application Number	10/040,438
		Filing Date	January 9, 2002
		First Named Inventor	Nagashima, Hirokl
		Art Unit	2625
(to be used for all correspondence efter initial filling)		Examiner Name	Kassa, Yosef
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	13877
	ENCLO	SUREB (check all that apply)	
Fee Transmittal Form	☐ Drawing(s)		After Allowance Communication to TC
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
Amendment / Reply	Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Erief)
After Final		o Convert to a al Application	Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Attorney, Revocation of Correspondence Address	Status Letter
Extension of Time Request	Terminal.	Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Express Abandonment Request	I <u> </u>	or Refund	Response to Restriction Requirement
☐ Information Disclosure Statement	☐ Lar	ndscape Table on CD	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks		
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application			
Reply to Missing Parts			

under 37 CFR1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Dawell & Dawell, P.C Signature Printed Name Raiph A. Dowell Reg. Dale 26868 No.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mall in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Signature		
Typed or printed name	Dale	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or auggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Attorney Docket No. 13877

In re application of Nagashima et al.)
Serial No.:10/040,438)) Art Unit: 2625)
Filed :January, 9, 2002) Examiner: Kassa, Yosef)
For: IMAGE-EFFECT METHOD AND IMAGE INTERPOLATION METHOD)))
)

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 24, 2005, Applicant hereby provisionally elects Group II - Claims 15 - 42. The election is made with traverse.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims in Group I and II are related as subcombinations usable together in a single combination.

The traversal of the restriction requirement is based on a lack of a showing in the Restriction Requirement of the serious burden that would be imposed if all the claims were examined in a single application. It is respectfully submitted that the

- 2 -

search and examination of the claim Groups could be made without serious burden. MPEP § 803 indicates that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions". Specifically, although it is alleged that the distinct inventions "have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification," MPEP §808.02(1) requires not only that the distinct inventions have acquired separate status in the art by showing their separate classification, but also that "a separate field of search" is required. It is respectfully submitted that no such showing is made out in the Restriction Requirement. To the contrary, although Applicant's counsel will not claim to be skilled in using the Manual of Classification, it appears that it would be necessary to search the claims in the Groups in each of the subclasses listed on page 2 of the Restriction Requirement to fully search these inventions. For this reason, it does not appear that a prima facie showing of the need for restriction of the claims in Groups I and II has been established, and in the absence of such a showing, Applicant traverses and requests reconsideration of the restriction requirement.

Dated: 02/24/2005

- 3 -

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in better condition for examination on the merits and allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Ву

Registration No. 26868

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph A. Dowell

Dowell & Dowell, P.C.

Suite 406

2111 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22314

U.S.A.

Telephone: 703-415-2555